A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Prudential Steamship Corp., 17 State Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ernest Allen Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York City, N.Y.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association I.O.M.M. & P., Post Office Box 601, Canal Zone.

A. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

A. Leland M. Walker, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Narvin B. Weaver, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Weaver & Van Koughnet, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lt. Col. John A. Ryan, Jr.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Edward P. Whitney, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurens Williams, 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Aid Program in Vietnam Not a Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1959, I had taken the floor to advise the Members that the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Foreign Affairs Committee would hold hearings to be fully briefed on the situation of our aid program in Vietnam, with particular reference to the series of articles written by Mr. Colegrove and appearing in the Scripps-Howard chain.

The hearings conducted by the subcommittee on the Colegrove articles were completed last Friday, August 14, and at that time I issued the following statement:

The Subcommittee on the Far East has been conducting a continuing review of our aid programs in the area under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. In an effort to be fully informed about progress achieved in this field, the subcommittee has conducted on-the-spot investigations, and supplemented them periodically with hearings.

The U.S. aid program in Vietnam, being within the area of the subcommittee's jurisdiction, has received close and continuing attention.

The series of articles which appeared recently in one of the local newspapers, alleging that the aid program in Vietnam is a fiasco, and that the administration of that program has been fraught with corruption, mismanagement, and other abuses, has received the subcommittee's immediate attention.

After reviewing these charges in an executive session on July 27, the subcommittee decided to examine them thoroughly. The author of the charges, Mr. Albert Colegrove, Government officials responsible for the administration of the aid program in Vietnam, and other interested persons were invited to testify before the subcommittee.

The hearings which the subcommittee has conducted have thus far failed to bear out the charge that our aid program in Vietnam is a fiasco, and that it has been administered in a scandalous manner.

These accusations, as well as specific charges of wrongdoing, have not been substantiated to date. Many of these charges have been traced to sources which I, for one, must regretfully consider to be less than reliable.

In contrast, the testimony which the subcommittee received from reliable observers who had firsthand knowledge of the aid program in Vietnam, and from executive branch witnesses, indicates strongly that the aid program in Vietnam has been constructive, successful, and responsibly administered.

Because of its desire to be as thorough as possible in examining Mr. Colegrove's charges, and to correct any weaknesses or waste in the aid program, a special study mission of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, headed by Congressman PILCHER, Democrat, of Georgia, will conduct an on-the-spot investigation of certain items which have not been substantially explained.

The results of the subcommittee's inquiry and its findings will be referred to the Special Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs for further examination and appropriate action by that investigating body.

Walter Lee, Legislative Assistant to the House Committee on the Judiciary, To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to learn that Mr. Walter Lee, legislative assistant to the House Committee on the Judiciary, will soon retire from this position which he has held for more than 21 years.

The name of Walter Lee is synonymous with warm friendship, wholehearted cooperation, and diligent, effective work for the committee to which he is assigned and for the membership of the House as a whole.

During my public service, I have never know a finer, more sincere, more devoted, more dedicated public servant than Walter Lee, and I am profoundly grateful to him for his outstanding service and for the many instances in which he has personally assisted me with my work. He has indeed made noteworthy contributions to vital work of the Congress.

I heartily congratulate him and his family upon the completion of his magnificent service and wish for them every success and happiness in the future. Godspeed and good fortune to our dear, able, and esteemed friend, Walter Lee.

Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] appeared before the Senate Finance Committee in support of H.R. 10. This is the bill designed to provide self-employed persons with a voluntary pension plan similar to that now accorded employees covered by employer-financed pension, and is identical to my bill, S. 944.

I am very glad to see the able Senator from Utah giving his invaluable support to this proposal. It is a field that has been too long neglected, Mr. President.

Since the Senator from Utah presented such an excellent case for the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Senator's testimony.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 11, 1959

Re H.R. 10, Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 10, the Self-Employed Individual's Retirement Act of 1959.

On June 17 of this year, Mr. David A. Lindsay, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before this distinguished committee. As spokesman for the major opponent of this legislation, he said, "The

Treasury recognizes that present law does not give self-employed persons tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans."

In view of this statement, I don't believe it is necessary for me or other proponents of this legislation to waste your valuable time discussing whether or not an inequity exists. The Treasury Department admits it.

The people of Utah are greatly concerned about this situation, and many of them representing an excellent cross section of the self-employed farm folks, small retailers, lawyers, dentists, doctors, and many others have written me on numerous occasions urging the enactment of H.R. 10.

Naturally, they have given a lot of thought to their old age, and the vast majority of them say that they have nothing other than OASI to live on once they retire. They can't understand why they are being penalized because they are self-employed and do not work for a corporation. Gentlemen, with but few exceptions, these are the average people of my State, the middle-income group often referred to as the backbone of this great country of ours.

I am concerned about this inequity and I believe that the majority of our colleagues feel it is time to remedy it.

H.R. 10 was first introduced in 1951 and has been before the Congress for 8 years. It has always had bipartisan support from Members who feel that enactment of the bill is the best way to deal with this unfair situation.

While the Treasury Department has advanced a number of objections to the bill, their major argument is the one generally offered when all others have failed—"let's wait until the budgetary situation is more favorable for tax reduction." As part of this reasoning, they emphasize a revenue loss of $365 million, which to the best of my knowledge they are unable to substantiate. Because of my constituents' interest in this legislation, I have read a good part of the hearings on this bill and am inclined to feel that the maximum impact would not exceed $100 million the first year.

Gentlemen, I am very definitely interested in keeping our economy in a healthy state, as are all the Members of this Congress. Surely the effect of the tax loss in the case of H.R. 10 is small compared with the favorable effect it will have on the 10 million self-employed of this country.

These people are not asking local, State, or Federal governments to take care of them in their retired years. They are asking simply for a postponement of tax liability so that they may be able to set something aside for their old age. They are willing to put up the money when they are able to spare it from the demands of their business. All they are asking of us, the Congress of the United States, is that we offer them the same tax consideration that 18 million corporate employees are receiving, so that they can provide for themselves.

In my opinion, it is imperative that H.R. 10 be enacted in this 86th Congress.

Thanks for your courtesy.

U.S. Passport Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, appeared today before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and presented an excellent statement on proposed U.S. passport legislation. Many bills have been filed to limit the travel of certain U.S. citizens abroad, whose travel and activities might be detrimental to the security and basic foreign policies of the United States.

Congressman LINDSAY is well qualified to appear as an expert witness on passport legislation because of his top-level legal background and experience. He has served from 1955 to 1957 as executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. LINDSAY is a graduate of the Yale Law School and as an outstanding attorney, is admitted to the New York bar, the bar of U.S. Supreme Court, and the District of Columbia bar.

Mr. LINDSAY is a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York State Bar Association, and the American Bar Association. Mr. LINDSAY is making a fine record as a Member of the 86th Congress.

I am submitting this material for my colleagues in the Congress as well as the people of the United States so that these views can be carefully considered in working out the constitutional basis, and the correct legal method in obtaining good legislation in this important field of passport authorization and issuance.

The above mentioned follows:

U.S. PASSPORT LEGISLATION

(Statement of U.S. Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY of New York before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Tuesday, August 18, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee. I share your concern, and that of the Department of State whose representatives have already testified, over the absence of legislation, consistent with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases, to authorize the Secretary of State to exercise some measure of discretion in the issuance of passports. I am aware as we all are, that the matter of passports and their issuance, is necessarily an aspect of the conduct of foreign affairs, and in that sense, bears upon national and international security.

But in approaching the problem of devising legislation, I start with the premise that we are dealing here with a constitutional right. I am in firm agreement with the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases. While not deciding those cases on constitutional grounds, the Court nevertheless stated that "the right to travel is part of the liberty of which a citizen cannot be deprived without the due process of law of the fifth amendment." I agree wholeheartedly with that statement. I believe also that the right to travel is conjoint with and part of the first amendment—freedom of speech and assembly. I believe it to be the duty of this committee to study the substance of the right to travel with great care, realizing that any measures restricting this right are certain to be tested in the courts sooner or later—probably sooner. And I am particularly disturbed by what I feel are constitutional inadequacies in the legislation endorsed to you by the Department of State.

What is the right to travel? In my book it is one of the most fundamental liberties that we have. The Supreme Court tells us that it is "part of the liberty protected by the due process clause of the fifth amendment." The Solicitor General of the United States conceded as much in his argument before the Court in Kent and Dayton. But, as I stated at the outset, I would suggest also that it is a part of the first amendment. Of all the freedoms that we have, the one I should most hate to lose is freedom of speech. Speech is communication, and communication in this modern day is impossible without locomotion. Speech is meaningless unless thought of in the context of the physical and social aspects of human existence.

Constitutional sources strongly suggest that early Americans recognized a freedom to move beyond national frontiers. However uncertain its basis may have been, however unclear its limitations, the English recognized that freedom long before they crossed the Atlantic. The people of the Colonies, moreover, evidently took the freedom for granted; witness the constant movement between Colonies and to the west. That may explain why the freedom was not more clearly recognized in writing. The Declaration of Independence goes no further than to list as a grievance the restrictions which George the Third placed upon emigration. The Articles of Confederation merely guaranteed free movement between different colonies, though the Colonies, not yet joined in a more perfect union, were more like foreign countries to each other than the United States are today. Perhaps the most direct documentary evidence is to be found in the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1790 which declared "that emigration from the State shall not be prohibited."

These sources, taken together, and viewed in the light of the ninth amendment, warrant the assumption that omission of the words "right to travel," was not intended to eliminate the right. Nor is the omission inconsistent with a specific intention to include the right in free speech. The Constitution was designed to guide the United States for an indefinite period of time. It would have been impossible to enumerate the variety of ways in which free speech might be abridged—and the framers recognized this in the generality of the first amendment's language.

The specific problem your committee must wrestle with, Mr. Chairman, is that of finding a constitutional way of preventing hard-core, dedicated Communists from abusing the travel right by actively striving against our most supreme national interests.

Now let me make it absolutely clear that we are not here talking about anyone who is under indictment for the commission of any crime, or is under restraining order of any kind by any court, or has been stripped of any right or liberty by due process of law. As to these, we all agree that the right to travel ought to be, and can constitutionally be, curtailed. The nonindicted, non-court-restrained Communist presents a more difficult case. There may well be risks inherent in allowing a member of the Communist Party, or one identified as such by our intelligence units, free exit from our shores to travel abroad. But it is necessary to point out that this is true when Communists travel from Chicago to New York or from New York to the Bahamas, or from Dallas to Mexico, or from San Francisco to Buenos Aires or to any other South American country, none of which places requires a passport for exit or entry. It should be pointed out also that under the McCarran-Walter Act we are required to deport alien members of the Communist Party and we go to elaborate efforts to secure their removal after they have been traveling freely in this country for years. Well and good enough. Yet under our passport procedures, until the Supreme Court decided otherwise, we have insisted that it is essential to the national security to keep citizen members of the party confined to our shores. The point is that there

could possibly be something wrong with our reasoning; and when we are dealing with limitations on constitutional rights it is important that our reasoning be compelling and logical. You must consider whether the bills before you will in fact accomplish their purpose of confining trained subversives to these shores. You must remember, also, that the President has in the past stressed the importance of taking every reasonable step that will facilitate international travel and exchange, e.g., the abolition of the requirement of finger printing for transients through, and temporary visitors to, this country.

I do not differ too widely in substance from the position taken by the administration, as presented by the State Department through its spokesman, Mr. Hanes, in his testimony here. I shall come to the differences shortly, and although seemingly small, they are important ones. I do differ widely in emphasis. I would emphasize the obligation of the Department of State—for that matter, of every executive department—to scrupulously avoid to the greatest extent possible any intrusion on the precious rights of American citizens. The right to travel, although it has been around a long while, is just beginning to be articulated. We must be careful not to let a cavalier approach lead us to legislative decisions which the courts may undo, and quite properly so.

I agree with the State Department that it is indeed fundamental that the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution is not absolute. "Civil liberties," says the Supreme Court "imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses." Freedom to travel, like other liberties, is subject to reasonable regulation and control in the interests of the public welfare. I am not sure that it is possible to draw up absolutely fixed rules which will in advance strike a proper balance which will meet the exigencies of every case, protect the public interest, and yet stay within constitutional limitations. Circumstances and the times vary and "due process of law has never been a term of fixed and invariable content." But let's make sure we don't "throw out the baby with the bath." I should like therefore to restate what I believe to be the guideposts which should guide the Congress in its consideration of this subject:

First, the right to travel—to communicate—is a constitutionally protected right which may not be abrogated by the State except under the general war power, which normally may be invoked only in time of extreme emergency, usually involving armed conflict between nations. The right is a concomitant of, and conjoint with, the first amendment of the Constitution. A denial of a passport therefore, may result in violations of both the fifth and first amendments.

Second, neither the right of the citizen to have issued, nor the right of the Secretary of State to deny issuance of, a passport is an absolute right.

Third, a general standard under which the Secretary of State is authorized to deny the issuance of a passport whenever he finds that its issuance would be contrary to the national welfare, safety or security, or otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States is too indefinite a standard when applied to a right as firmly grounded among our basic liberties as is freedom of speech and assembly. In the past we have too often seen examples of executive arbitrariness under the umbrella of the national security and the conduct of foreign relations.

Fourth, a refusal to issue a passport may not rest upon confidential undisclosed information, under a blanket, unlimited authority to use the same. Such a refusal would, in all probability, be a denial of due process of law under the fifth amendment. The authority to use confidential information in the administrative process, under imprecise standards, coupled with the power to delegate authority to subordinates, and without full judicial review, can result in a breeding ground of arbitrariness in the course of which innocent people may, and undoubtedly will, suffer.

You will note that I have spoken here of blanket, unlimited authority to use confidential information. There may be room for an exception to cover the hard core Communist case, under which the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary, personally, will certify, first, that disclosure will expose a "double" or "buried" agent of tested and known reliability; second, that such exposure will be prejudicial to the national interests, and third, that the case may not be decided without resort to such evidence. But even then, full access to the evidence in question should be given upon judicial review to the court, under seal, for examination by the court in camera.

Thus the two important points of difference between the Department of State's views and mine are (1) I would permit confidential information to be used only upon certification at the highest level of its special necessity, and (2) I would require that the whole of the confidential information be laid under seal before the reviewing judge in chambers. In my judgment, anything less might violate the due process requirement of the fifth amendment.

Turning then to the bills before this committee, to the extent that time has permitted me to review them, I believe that H.R. 7006, which the State Department has endorsed, is lacking in the necessary procedural safeguards of a constitutional right. Since H.R. 2468 contains no review provision at all, it seems deficient in this respect, as well as in the others enumerated by the Department. Nor does H.R. 5455 provide such safeguards in my judgment.

I find that H.R. 55, in its present form, contains the words "on the record" at line 11, page 3, which are ambiguous. I understand from Mr. Hanes' statement that there is legislative history behind these words, and if they can fairly be deemed to mean "on the record, open and closed," that bill contains, at least in part, the standards I should like to see applied.

The best approach to the procedural problem of the bills presently before you, in my opinion, is contained in title III of H.R. 8329. In its requirement in section 306(b) that the Secretary of State himself make the final administrative determination upholding a refusal to issue, or a revocation of, a passport, it goes far toward providing for due caution in the evaluation of confidential information. And its section 307 provides what no other House bill I have examined does: the kind of judicial review necessary, in my judgment, to meet the constitutional test of due process.

I have not in this discussion tried to spell out an entire code to govern the issuance of passports, or to draft legislation. My purpose here has been only to state my views on some of the fundamentals, and I would hope that consideration of this matter in the Congress would be guided by those fundamentals. Neither have I touched upon the whole subject of area restrictions, except indirectly. Here I would recommend the report of the special committee to study passport procedures of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, an excellent report, prepared by a distinguished committee of lawyers. Its conclusion on the subject of area restraints is as follows:

"Travel abroad by all U.S. citizens may be prohibited in areas where the Secretary of State determines that such prohibitions should be imposed in the national interest, but only in situations of exceptional gravity. The imposition of area restrictions should be accompanied by a statement by the Secretary of State setting forth the reasons therefor. Exceptions to general area prohibitions, permitting travel by particular individuals or groups, may be made by the Secretary of State in his discretion."

In closing, I should like to make reference to a document of great importance which is too seldom invoked. It is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which this year celebrated its 10th anniversary. Article 13 of the declaration reads as follows:

"ART. 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

The United States along with the other member nations, has pledged itself to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect and observance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the declaration. Let us in the United States be faithful to our pledge.

Veto of Oil Leasing Bill for Alaska Unwarranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that President Eisenhower's veto of H.R. 6940, a bill which would have increased the maximum allowable acreage for oil and gas leasing in Alaska from 300,000 acres to 600,000 acres was ill-advised and uncalled for. Alaska's size, equaling five Western States, plus the need for incentives to bring about exploration of remote areas subject to the high costs which prevail in Alaska, requires an increase from 300,000 to 600,000 acres.

The fact that the Department of the Interior expresses preference for a package bill to increase lease rentals and abolish the existing waiver of rentals for the second and third year has nothing whatsoever to do with my bill which has been vetoed. Interior's package plan could, in the wisdom of Congress, be put into effect regardless of the provisions of H.R. 6940. The maximum allowable acreage in Alaska has nothing to do with rental rates and waivers or nonwaivers of rentals. It is admitted that this veto will deprive the State of needed income by curbing increased leasing at this time, but is piously justified on the theory that it will be better for the State and the Nation in the long run.

The Interior Department made only a meager showing regarding the bill during the House and Senate committee hearings, expressing no firm position regarding monopolies, and could not justify its proposal that a separate leasing area be established for that part of Alaska north of the Brooks Range. That this is true is evidenced by the favorable reports made by both the Senate and House

committees which conducted the hearings. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, was unanimous in finding that the increased acreage would not be monopolistic and that the legislation would be conducive to orderly, yet accelerated, development of the oil resources of Alaska. The evidence also showed that there was no unanimity of opinion within the Department of the Interior itself, and that the opinion expressed by the witness for the Department, at the hearings, that there should be a separate leasing area north of the Brooks Range, was only a makeshift.

The President's action is a reflection of departmental arrogance directed at the House and Senate Interior Committees—and the Congress of the United States—for having the temerity to legislate with a slight variance from the conclusion submitted by the Interior Department. I consider this veto to be an unwarranted overriding of congressional discretion and judgment.

The Invisible Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the first scene is the White House, Washington, D.C., United States of America.

It is an evening late in June 1959.

The quiet hum of motor cars in the distance has the beat of time, rising and falling, as the cars come and go.

The President is alone at his desk.

It is a warm, humid twilight. Even the sightseers have been forced to seek air-conditioned relief from the accumulated heat of the day.

One motorist turns on his lights prematurely, eager for the help of night.

The President is tired. He has worked a long, hard day, and the news has not been good.

He picks up a dispatch from his desk.

"Soviet delegate won't yield an inch. Geneva Conference adjourns in stalemate. No progress expected when talks resume."

The President reaches for a sheet of White House stationery. The time has come to do something different. Perhaps a face-to-face meeting with Khrushchev will soothe his pride and make him more cooperative. If I invite him to the United States and arrange for him to view our industrial might and our military power, and let him see all the comforts and luxuries that our people enjoy, he will realize that our people are happy in their personal progress, and have no thought for anything else. That should impress him as to our peaceful intentions. The friendship approach will accomplish more than months of stiff, formal, and fruitless debate.

He starts to write, then looks up quickly, listening.

It sounded like a cry out there—a man's cry—suddenly choked off.

But as far as he can see in the deepening dusk, there is only the chain of passing headlights, broken by the bushes and the trees that are more substantial than the night.

He waits but the voice does not cry out again.

Where did it come from?

He listens but there is no human sound above the hum of the motor traffic, rising and falling, like mechanical breathing.

"Strange. That cry in the night. I'd swear that someone was trying to warn me, but I must be mistaken. Just nerves," he said to himself.

The President frowned, then relaxed.

And went on writing the invitation to Khrushchev.

Scene 2, the Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

It is after 9 p.m. in Washington, but 4 a.m. of the following day in an office within the fortress walls of the Soviet capitol.

Red Square is empty.

Except for the security police and the guards who are blended with the night, there is no sign of life. But the people of Moscow, after replenishing their energies through sleep, will soon rise and breakfast and hurry to work. They will continue their heroic efforts to strengthen Mother Russia and protect her against the aggressive plots of the capitalist warmongers. Or so they will be told, over and over again, by their Communist bosses. But they will work hard. They are used to it. They have no other choice.

The bald-headed man who got up early to digest the evening-before news from Washington, pushes his chair away from the desk, and folds his hands across his paunch which is round and firm, like half a globe. His voice is vigorous and jubilant.

"Comrade Secretary, you are the first to know of the great Soviet victory."

The Secretary, who was sifting papers on the desk, dropped them in his surprise and confusion. Was the leader of Communist imperialism in earnest, or was he joking? One could never be sure. And it was dangerous to guess wrong.

"But, if you will excuse me, Comrade Khrushchev, there has been no special report from Deputy Premier Kozlov in Washington."

Khrushchev smiled at his aide's ignorance and bewilderment. When people are uncertain and afraid, like this honest bureaucrat, they can be manipulated so easily.

Khrushchev wagged his finger. "One must be ahead of developments, with the nose to smell them before they can be seen. The President of the United States is going to invite me to visit Washington because I planned it that way."

The Secretary stared, not knowing what to say.

"I can see, Comrade, that you do not understand the efficiency of our methods," Khrushchev said. "With these Americans, who are thin on patience, it is only a matter of time before we wear them down. Gromyko has done well at Geneva. He has been our Gibraltar, a face of stone, deaf to the arguments of the Western diplomats, causing them frustration and loss of confidence. And when the Americans cannot find a solution, they think that friendship will 'melt' us. How childish. They have so much to learn, but they are so impatient. They think that I will be impressed, like some peasant, when I see their luxuries. But I will be using them, and I will be exploiting their weaknesses every minute, for the greatest propaganda triumph in the history of Communist Russia."

"Would you say then," the Secretary began, but stopped, dazzled by the prospects.

"Go on, Comrade."

"Would you say that this marks the strategic breakthrough for your psychological war against the West?"

Khrushchev grinned.

"We have induced the United States to tranquilize itself. The President and his advisers do not know that we have fooled them into making the invisible retreat."

Secretary of State Herter at Santiago Ministers' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter at the fifth meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American States, at Santiago, Chile, on August 12, 1959, in response to the address of welcome by President Jorge Allessandri Rodriguez of Chile and in behalf of the Foreign Ministers:

Your Excellency, in behalf of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting here in this hospitable capital I am honored to be entrusted with our collective expression of gratitude for the welcome extended by you and your Government. Your cordial words of greeting warm our hearts. No place could be more appropriate for sessions consecrated to preserving the peace and freedom of America. The devotion of the Chilean people to Pan American ideals of peace and cooperation, their dedicated efforts and achievements in economic and social progress, and their firm adherence to democratic principles, are widely recognized throughout our American community of nations. As long ago as 1541, when this noble and beautiful city of Santiago was founded by Pedro de Valdivia, that far-sighted hero struck a prophetic and truly American note when he declared in a letter to the King that Santiago would grow and flourish provided only that nobody should be sent out from Spain or from other areas of the New World to interfere with its affairs.

Against the heroic background of Chilean history looms Chile's cultural achievements. It is no accident that in her universities were trained many political and intellectual leaders from other American countries. The agricultural and technical development here

has been accompanied, indeed has been stimulated, by the imaginative energy of a creative people. It is an augury of success that our sessions are being held in such an environment.

I appreciate Your Excellency's expression of Chile's sympathetic interest in the efforts of the great powers to seek a stable world peace through discussion of their differences. As you know, I have just returned from a meeting of this kind in Geneva. In contrast to that gathering, however, I think the issues to be decided at the meeting of Foreign Ministers in this city appear more capable of early solution. Your Excellency brilliantly summarized the issues before us by stating that we should seek a formula that harmonizes our heartfelt desire never to see human rights violated with our absolute respect for the principle of nonintervention, thus guaranteeing an international liberty indispensable for living together harmoniously and sanely in this hemisphere. As Your Excellency states, this international democratic policy can be fortified by the fullest utilization of our economic capabilities.

At their informal meeting in Washington last year the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics reaffirmed their recognition that inter-American solidarity is an essential factor in the stability not only of our hemisphere but of the world. They likewise affirmed the present need for a renewed dedication by our peoples and our governments to the inter-American ideals of independence, political liberty, and economic and cultural progress and for a renewed faith in our capacity to achieve them. On December 24, 1958, the Eighth International Conference of American States approved "the Declaration of Lima." That declaration begins with the forthright statement "that the peoples of America have achieved spiritual unity through the similarity of their republican institutions, their unshakeable will for peace, their profound sentiment of humanity and tolerance and, through their absolute adherence to the principles of international law, of the equal sovereignty of states and of individual liberty without religious or racial prejudice." It closes with a provision for meetings of consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics when deemed desirable and at the initiative of any one of them.

We may say that the Declaration of Lima comes of age this current year, the 21st since its adoption. During these 21 years, our 21 Republics have convoked 5 meetings of consultation of their Foreign Ministers for the purpose of maintaining the peace and independence of the hemisphere and preserving our freedom and progress toward a better life.

That has always been the American ideal. Peace is our chosen environment, freedom and progress our chosen way of life. The American peoples have never believed that one could be valid without the other. Our Republics are founded on the concept of independence with law, freedom with order. Our revolutions were fought—all of them—to attain a freedom both for states and for individuals dedicated to the development of the progress which can be achieved only through peace.

It is in response to that undeviating concept—peace with freedom and progress—that we are met in this historical capital of a free progressive and peace-loving country. The convocation of a meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers is in itself evidence that a crisis exists. It is at the same time proof of our united belief, supported by our experience, that the crisis can be met and its problems solved if dealt with cooperatively in a spirit of reason and good will.

Let us remember that there have been in all the course of our common history very few armed conflicts across national boundaries in this hemisphere. No comparable area of the world so large in extent, so great in population, with so many basic mutual interests, affording nevertheless such varied surface points of difference, has ever developed into an international neighborhood like that of the Americas. The unguarded frontier is a commonplace of national life with most of our peoples. The Christ of the Andes represents not only a lofty international ideal but a customary international relationship, the same ideal and relationship which farther to the North—Mexico, Canada and my own country attest to with bridges across the boundary rivers.

Just as there is no comparable area of the world living so harmoniously with its neighbors as the American Republics, there is none other that has so long a record of freedom. Our 21 nations, neighbors by the accident of geography, free and independent by instinct and by choice, have been closely and freely associated friendly peoples. From their republican beginnings, independence has been fortified and augmented by cooperation through increased contacts between our peoples in all fields of life. We have developed wider areas of mutual understanding. Cooperation in economic and social fields has been intensified, moving forward with both national and international efforts toward the achievement of greater productivity and higher living standards for our peoples. The progress made this past year in this field of inter-American economic cooperation, particularly under the inspiration of Operation Pan America, has been highly significant and holds out the promise of further gains in the future.

Nor has any other comparable area achieved an international organization like ours—an organization voluntary, continuous, and potent as a matter of historic fact. We all know that the development of the United Nations and other international organizations owed much to the experience of the Organization of the American States, precisely because of the proved effectiveness of our own inter-American experience. The 21 American Republics became charter members of the United Nations. In that body's councils, year after year we have stood together in defense of the free world and in the maintenance of peace and security.

Our inter-American system has worked well. At various times in its history it has faced crises and surmounted them with renewed vitality and increased capacity for constructive achievement. The balance of peace with freedom and progress that has characterized our system has constituted an inspiring demonstration to the entire world of how nations large and small may live and work together toward the common goals of humanity.

Our present meeting here in Santiago comes at a time when our inter-American system again faces a critical moment in history. We are called upon as we have been called upon in the past to renew and revitalize in the light of present conditions and forces the principles that have made our great achievements possible.

Four of these principles which are expressed in the charter of the Organization of American States are particularly pertinent to the situation facing the Organization today. There is first the principle of nonintervention, which has served as a foundation stone for the relations between our countries. Second is the principle of collective security. Together these two principles form the basis for peace and independence on this continent. Third is the principle of the effective exercise of representative democracy and respect for human rights. Fourth is cooperation for economic and social progress. This is of particular pertinence to our time. Together these latter two underlie the achievement of freedom and progress. Our problem today is to restore the traditional balance between peace on the one hand and freedom and progress on the other by giving a proper emphasis to each of these four outstanding principles. We have recognized these four principles as valid in themselves and have learned that our separate, no less than our mutual well-being depends in large measure upon them. When any of these principles is threatened, the individual independence and the collective peace of the American peoples is threatened as is their capacity to progress toward better human life. Against such threats the American nations must at all times marshal their collective effort to insure their continued progress.

We are gathered together here to examine and analyze in a spirit of objectivity and with a common purpose. We will not let ourselves be deluded into mistaking a temporary disorder for a cancer in the heart of peace or for a permanent paralysis of the sinews of freedom. Neither will we permit ourselves to be deceived into dismissing negligently symptoms of a disorder that might adversely affect us all. The American hemisphere is a community of freedom under law and so it must remain for our own generation and for our children's children.

This year in my country we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, whose faith in freedom and devotion to peace have caused other American countries to commemorate his anniversary. At the outset of our proceedings at this meeting we may well recall his exhortation: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us; our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere."

Miss Elizabeth A. Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to announce the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart who died in a hospital in Washington, D.C., last Sunday, August 16.

Miss Smart was well known to Members of the House and Senate, as well as others on Capitol Hill. They knew her especially because of her championing the cause of temperance. She represented the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Washington. No one, to my knowledge, was more diligent and more effective in opposition to the sale and distribution of intoxicating liquors.

She was highly respected by everyone who knew her, even those who disagreed with her views. She was deeply religious, she was sincere, she was a great Christian character.

Even though Miss Smart has passed from this life, her influence and her effectiveness will live on in the years to come. The great organization she represented and the country have suffered a distinct loss of a great American.

Decisions of the Supreme Court That Have Attempted To Alter and Revise the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include therein a series of three Washington reports made by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, of California. These reports treat with the dangers of this Republic by reason of a long line of judicial decisions handed down by the Supreme Court over the last several years which tend to decrease the sovereign powers of the several States by denying the States the right to legislate in areas not under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. UTT also attacks the Court for attempting to write new words and phrases into the Constitution which are not there, and which if accepted as law would greatly weaken the Constitution which is the very foundation of the political life of this Republic.

The above-mentioned Washington reports follow:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 6, 1959.

For some time I have been torn between two admonitions of significant virtue; one by my father when he said, "Son, if you can't speak well of someone, don't speak at all," the second one by Abraham Lincoln when he said, "To keep silent when one has the duty to speak out is a sin." Believing that tolerance can be a sin as well as a virtue, I have resolved this dilemma by accepting the Lincoln doctrine as a responsibility of the highest magnitude. There is aways a straw which breaks the camel's back and a catalyst which sets off a mental or physical explosion.

The catalyst in this case was the undignified performance of Chief Justice Earl Warren at a Sunday evening cocktail party in which he called Earl Mazo "a damned liar" when Mazo denied that in his new biography of Vice President NIXON he was spotlighting NIXON at the expense of the Chief Justice. Mazo asked the Chief Justice if he had read the book. The Chief Justice replied "No," and Mazo's rejoinder was, "I hope to God for the sake of the country that your decisions are based on much more full and accurate evidence than judgments on a book you haven't even read."

This last rejoinder must have struck a tender spot, as it must be recalled that in the desegregation opinion which overthrew the 58-year-old Supreme Court doctrine, the Chief Justice, after citing certain authorities, added, "And see, generally, Myrdal, 'Our American Dilemma.' "

While I am opposed to segregation, I am unalterably opposed to having the Supreme Court rely upon sociology instead of legal authorities. The Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal, in his book cited by Warren's opinion as an authority, also stated that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions, and that its adoption was nearly a plot against the common people." What hogwash. What poppycock. And what a slander against our Founding Fathers. Any student of our Constitution should know that it was founded upon Judaic-Christian religion, with a profound reverence for the Greek philosophers, B.C., the Roman law, and above all, the Magna Carta of 1215, and the Common Law of England, and was beamed to protect and increase the freedom and dignity of the individual under a God-ordained universe.

At this point I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not attacking the Supreme Court as an institution, but rather my remarks are leveled at the members of the present Court and their sociological philosophies upon which they have based so many of their opinions, in some of the most amazing decisions ever handed down by that august body. Contrary to popular opinion, the Supreme Court rulings are in no sense the supreme law of the land. The supreme law of the land is referred to in an article of the Constitution which does not even mention the Supreme Court at all.

Article III provides: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." The judicial power is not indivisible. Article III, section 2, says that "The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and to fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." Congress, therefore, is given the sole right to divide this judicial power between the Supreme Court and the lower courts. The Constitution and some of the amendments are full of limitations upon the Supreme Court.

Article VI defines the supreme law of the land by saying, "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." You will note that the Supreme Court is not even mentioned in this definition. No Federal court is given any authority under the Constitution to change it by a single word nor to evade it by subterfuge, and any attempt to do so is as unlawful as rape, and just as despicable, even though perpetrated by prima donnas.

Speaking of prima donnas, in 1957 when the American Bar met in London to pay tribute to the signing of the Magna Carta by King John, the Chief Justice was an invited guest. After accepting the invitation, he heard that Vice President NIXON was also an invited guest, and the Chief Justice notified his London host that if NIXON was going to be there, he, the Chief Justice, would decline to attend. The reason? Under protocol, the Vice President outranks the Chief Justice. How horrible. The Chief Justice was not the least concerned over the embarrassment this caused his hosts in making it necessary for them to recall their invitation to the Vice President of the United States. However, if it were not for this trait, Mr. Warren would not be Chief Justice, because when he was promised the first vacancy on the Supreme Court, and that vacancy was created by the death of Chief Justice Vinson, he demanded this appointment as Chief Justice, and would not accept an appointment as an Associate Justice.

The Supreme Court has no authority to question the wisdom of any law. It can only determine its constitutionality. It is an equal and coordinate branch of our Government, and therefore has no authority to invade the jurisdiction of the executive branch, nor the legislative branch, and yet an examination of a score or two of the decisions of the present members of the Supreme Court establishes a record of invasion upon the rights, duties, privileges, and immunities of the other two branches. More than that, examination will prove that the Court has entered upon an attempt to repeal and rewrite many articles and amendments to the Constitution.

This duplicity is so outstanding that it comes within the purview of Lincoln's admonition that "to keep silent when one has a duty to speak out is a sin." A partial list of these decisions and their effect upon our Constitution will be included in next week's report. These decisions strike at the very heart of our Government, and tend to destroy the right of the individual to have a voice in his government at the State and community level.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 13, 1959.

In my report last week I indicated that I would cite several recent decisions of the Supreme Court which strike at the very foundation upon which our republic is built, and which create a sociological philosophy that the Constitution was created to defend the Court rather than that the Court was created to defend the Constitution. The Constitution must be supreme over the Court, and not the Court over the Constitution.

The Constitution is a document of strict limitations, and prohibits the Federal Government from doing anything not permitted by the Constitution. The 10th amendment states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now comes the Supreme Court with the opinion that none of the States can enact and enforce laws dealing with Communist subversion and antisedition laws, because Congress had legislated in that field, and therefore preempted it. This decision involved the case of Steve Nelson who was convicted under Pennsylvania antisedition laws. He was an admitted Communist leader, but the Court held that because Congress had passed the Smith Act (an antisedition law) any State law dealing with this subject was henceforth null and void. Under that decision the previous convictions of the 10 top Communists in California, which were under appeal, were automatically reversed, and these Communists were set free. The Smith Act in no sentence or pargraph indicated that Congress intended to preempt this field, nor are such laws prohibited to the States by the Constitution. How then could the Supreme Court reach such a conclusion?

Under this "doctrine of preemption" no State could enact and enforce a little Lindbergh kidnaping law, because Congress has legislated in this field, and the enactment and enforcement of our State narcotics control laws are likewise in jeopardy under this doctrine.

The great political strength of this country lies in the fact that it has 50 separate States, each with its constitution, its own legislature, its own constabulary, and its own legal department, so that just in case the Federal Government should be subverted there would yet remain 50 distinct entities with exactly the same character. No "coup" could take place in this country such as have taken place in many countries, and for the very reason just stated.

In *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire* the Supreme Court held that the attorney general of that State had no right to question a college professor about subversive activities, and held further, in *Raley et al* v. *Ohio* that the State could not punish a witness for contempt for his refusal to answer questions by its legislature regarding his subversive activities. This line of decisions has given aid and comfort to the Communists, and follows

the social philosophy of some members of the Supreme Court rather than the rule of law.

I said last week that the Supreme Court had no authority to add one word nor to delete a word from the Constitution, yet in the Watkins case it attempted to do just that. Congress had voted a contempt action against John T. Watkins for refusing to answer questions of the Un-American Activities Committee. In the opinion written by Chief Justice Warren, he said, "* * * nor can the first amendment freedoms of speech, press, religion, or political belief or association be abridged." Now the first amendment does guarantee freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly, but where, oh where in the first amendment are listed freedoms of "political belief" and "association"? These words simply do not appear in the Constitution, and yet the Supreme Court is attempting to solidify this into accepted law.

I could cite a dozen other cases which I feel constitute a frontal attack against our Constitution, and it is shocking to know that none of the Justices of the Supreme Court has ever taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution, as members of the other branches of government do, and as required by the Constitution itself. They simply sign a watered-down version to administer justice according to the best of their ability and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

I have introduced legislation to require all Federal judges and justices to take the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, and which I have taken as a Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 20, 1959.

This report concludes a series of three, relative to decisions of the Supreme Court that have attempted to alter and revise the Constitution of the United States. Additional opinions to those heretofore cited are set forth in this final report. I do not believe that the general public is aware of the serious effect which has resulted to law enforcement agencies and others by striking down the right of the States to legislate and enforce laws which rightly fall within the jurisdiction of the State. Until the effect strikes you individually, you will continue to be complacent.

The Mallory case is one in point. After Mallory was convicted of rape, and there was no question of his guilt, as he had confessed, nevertheless the Supreme Court ordered him freed because the arresting officers had detained him for questioning before indictment. It was impossible to have a new trial because the same defense would obtain, and there was nothing to do but wait for Mr. Mallory to strike again, which he did within a few months after his release. If it had been your daughter who was the victim of this assault, you would not feel kindly toward the judges who released him, knowing that he was guilty in the first instance.

In the case of Clinton E. Jencks, who had been convicted of Communist activities, he was released by the Supreme Court because the trial judge refused to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation open its files on the matter. In this case there could have been a new trial had the FBI been willing to open its complete files. The Justice Department felt that it would reveal its sources of evidence on other investigations, and would destroy the effectiveness of the FBI. So, rather than comply with the admonition of the Court, they did not bring Jencks to trial again. Mr. Jencks is now attending the University of California under a foundation grant for the purpose of obtaining teacher's credentials qualifying him to teach your children and mine, and under the rulings of the Court he cannot be denied a teacher's certificate on the grounds of Communist association.

This is one area where the present Supreme Court has reversed an interpretation of the free speech amendment which has long been an accepted doctrine. In *Gitlow* v. *New York*, U.S. Reports, page 667, the opinion by Justice Sanford reads in part: "And, for yet more imperative reasons, a State may punish utterances endangering the foundations of organized government and threatening its overthrow by unlawful means. These imperil its own existence as a constitutional State. Freedom of speech and press * * * does not protect disturbances to the public peace or the attempt to subvert the Government. It does not protect publications or teachings which tend to subvert or imperil the Government or to impede or hinder it in the performance of its governmental duties." In other words, it has always been the rule that the right of free speech guaranteed by the first amendment did not give sanctuary to those people whose purpose is to overthrow the Government by force and violence, thereby destroying the Government which gave them the right of free speech. However, under the recent rulings which include cases of subversion and cases involving the right to teach an idea, even though that idea could be adultery, as in the "Lady Chatterley's Lover" case, sabotage, or effective methods of overthrowing the Government by force and violence, the limit of free speech is not breached until an overt act has been committed, implementing the teaching of the idea. In other words, you can teach the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, but you are not a criminal until you light the fuse.

One final case of incompetency of the Court was revealed in one of the shortest opinions on record. In the matter of the Evetts Haley, Jr. case, reversing Federal Judge T. Winfield Davidson's decision, the opinion in full is herewith stated: "The judgment is reversed. *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111." It is my candid opinion that any freshman in law school who would cite *Wickard* v. *Filburn* as an authority for reversing the Haley case would be washed out of school as an incompetent. I do not say that the Court might not have reached the same conclusion under the broad powers granted under the "commerce" clause of the Constitution, but surely the reversal of Judge Davidson's decision merited more than four words.

The Haley case involved the planting of wheat and its consumption on the farm without an allotment from the Department of Agriculture. The Government had imposed a fine of $506.11 against Haley because he grew 43 acres of wheat on his 1,660-acre cattle ranch. Mr. Haley had never received any subsidies for anything on his farm, and in the case which the Supreme Court cited as authority for reversal, the defendant, Filburn, had received subsidies by way of parity payments, and fed his wheat, grown on the surplus acreage, to his livestock. In that case, the Court used 23 pages of opinion to arrive at its conclusion, and on page 131 of that decision stated, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." On page 133 of that decision the Court concluded "that appellee is the worse off for the aggregate of this legislation does not appear; it only appears that, if he could get all that the Government gives and do nothing that the Government asks, he would be better off than this law allows."

There you have it. The Filburn case was based on the Government's right to control that which it subsidizes, and in the Haley case, no subsidy whatsoever was involved, and for the Court to cite the Filburn case as an authority for reversal is simply juvenile.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 1959

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee grant unto us who in the morning seek Thy face fervently to desire, wisely to discern, and obediently to fulfill all that is according to Thy will.

Unite our hearts and minds to bear with patience the burdens these stressful times lay upon us.

Give Thy strengthening grace unto all here lifted into the ministry of public service that, putting aside partisan divisions, they may be given tallness of stature to see above the walls of prideful opinions the good of the largest number.

With besetting perils without, forbid that the precious oil of our national unity be spilled upon the ground to ignite selfish fires; may it still feed the flame of liberty's torch as it enlightens the whole darkened earth.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 18, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 18, 1959, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 162. An act for the relief of Henri Polak;

S. 593. An act for the relief of Angelinas Cuacos Steinberg;

S. 1053. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Montenegro;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Pak Jae Seun;

S. 1135. An act for the relief of Alice Kazana;

S. 1289. An act to increase and extend the special milk program for children;

S. 1455. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the preservation of acreage history and the reallocation of unused cotton acreage allotments;

S. 1512. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes;

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Skogen Woods;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Tse Man Chan;